

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes for the April 11, 2011 Meeting

Chairman: Oliver Smith; Vice Chairman: Anne Quinley; Secretary: Steve Hutchison

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent/Abstain A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance With N=Nay
P=Present R=Recused SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 10 April 2011

Approved: 11 April 2011 with corrections

1.

Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:

07:06

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H	C L O U T I E R	Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	L E W I S	N J O O R H W N O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	D A V I S	B A C H M A N
P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

Notes: Quinley arrived 7.10 pm

Quorum Established: 14

Yes (X)

Pledge of Allegiance

2.

Approval of Minutes: March 14, 2011

Motion: Approve Minutes of March 14, 2011

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Glavinic

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-0

3.

Open Forum:

3.a.

Oliver Smith announces that Victoria Cloutier has resigned her seat on VCCPG for personal reasons. Rudolf suggests that because of the urgency to fill the vacancy, a motion can be made to consider this item in the current meeting without the usual notice in the agenda.

Motion: Move to add an urgency item to the current agenda to deal with the resignation of V. Cloutier.

Maker/Second: Smith/Hofler

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0 Voice

Discussion: Glavinic suggests Nominations Sub-committee should consider those who previously ran unsuccessfully in the most recent election.

Motion: Move to accept V. Cloutier's resignation and ask Chair of Nominations SC to initiate replacement procedure

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Quinley

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0 Voice

4.

Announcements & Items of Public Interest for Discussion:

4.a.

Update on the \$425,000 Valley Center Road improvement list of proposed projects being reviewed and vetted by DPW (Bob Davis)

Davis reported a productive Mobility SC meeting with B. Goralka. The discussion included a review of the Valley View Casino agreement with the County followed by consideration of the 31 potential improvement suggestions made by the public and Mobility Sub-committee members. The County has addressed the suggestions, prioritizing them based on feasibility within the constraints of the available funds, and consistency with County engineering standards. Evaluation revealed some suggested improvements that the County decided to do on their own, such as improved Vesper Road/Valley Center Road intersection signage. Twelve of the suggested items made County priority list. Six items are recommended by the Mobility SC for execution.

4.b.

Serial meetings and the Brown Act (Smith)

Smith pointed out that the Brown Act is clear that the activities of VCCPG are important to public. Serial meetings, or emails from one to another of a quorum of VCCPG members, constitute a meeting. If such a serial meeting is determined to have occurred, certain votes or a series of votes by VCCPG could be nullified. If an email contains an opinion on an issue and is sent to a quorum of a

	subcommittee or the VCCPG, it is deemed a serial meeting. However, distributing factual information to be discussed at a future meeting of a SC or the VCCPG is not considered a serial meeting.	
4.c.	Subcommittee activities that extend to other subcommittees (Smith) Smith observed that subcommittees sometimes have overlapping issues. [e.g. South Village SC and Mobility SC]. Smith suggests enhanced consultation between SCs when there is an overlapping issue. SCs should err on the side of generous communication. Rudolf pointed out that some SCs are already holding joint meetings to address this issue.	
4.d.	Heritage Trail maintenance issues (Smith) Smith related that DPW Project Manager, Michael Long, apologized re default of the prime contractor on trail maintenance. Trails were to have weed maintenance contract for two years. DWP is working to restore the contract to achieve trail maintenance objectives. Smith noted considerable usage of the trail along Valley Center Road. Rudolf says the Trails Association been talking to Long for some time regarding maintenance, which includes weeding and plant replacement. Rudolf noted that the Trails Association is seen as the local supervisor of maintenance on Heritage Trail. Bret Black commented from the audience that he has an MA in ornamental horticulture and 55 years experience, and volunteered to assist M. Long. Black also addressed drought resistant plants.	
4.e.	Smith noted that the current I-15 Corridor representative desires to resign. He will place an item on next month's agenda to initiate replacement.	
5.	Action Items:	
5.a.	Update and possible vote on the Accretive Sustainable Community sub-committee formation. (Hutchison)	
Discussion: Hutchison reported that he had received nine applications for membership on the Accretive project SC and, after consultation with Cheryl Jones, the County's legal liaison, all were qualified [a tenth application was accepted at the end of the meeting, which was also deemed qualified]. He also noted that he had requested copies of all documents relevant to the proposed Accretive project from DPLU Director, Eric Gibson. The expectation was that there would be meaningful planning documents presented to the County sometime this summer.		
5.b.	P10-010; Lilac Ridge Verizon Wireless project, 10378 Lavender Point, Escondido, CA; Site Plan with Enlarged Storm Water Management Plan, elevations and other detailed drawings. (Anderson)	
Discussion: Anderson presented a request for a major use permit for a telephone cell tower. It would be an unmanned 35-foot tower with 12-foot tall equipment shelter. This request was previously approved on condition of addressing a storm water management plan and improved landscaping around facility. The County delayed process approval due to personnel changes. Glavinic asked for clarification of storm water runoff plan. Bachman says VCCPG may not need to vote again since the conditions were met. Rudolf agrees, but if further mitigations are needed, it should come back to VCCPG for vote.		
Motion: Move to approve this project		
Maker/Second: Anderson/Quinley		Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0 Voice
5.c.	Discussion on Mission Statement and possible re-titling of the Tribal Liaison sub-committee (Glavinic)	
Discussion: Glavinic says there continues to be considerable interaction with tribes. He thought it might be useful to include the city of Escondido as well, but backed away from that idea. He will continue to Interface with Indian tribes to the east and north of Valley Center, and will exchange planning information with the tribes. The proposed mission statement for the sub-committee is, "To exchange planning information from all neighboring tribes, this information should promote long-term cooperative and complementary planning between all parties. This planning information shall include, at a minimum, all of the following: Land Use, Traffic Circulation, other Infrastructure, and mutual economic viability." Jackson questions inclusion of the		

'economic viability' item in the statement. Glavinic wants to keep scope of information sharing broad to keep aware of what our neighbors are doing. Jackson suggest substituting 'better community interface'. Rudolf clarified economic viability as knowing tribal commercial intentions. Hutchison suggests inserting 'mutual' in front of 'economic viability'. Lewis asks who from tribes will be on SC. Besides J. Quisquis, Glavinic is not sure they can get additional representation. Nancy Layne suggested that the Tribes may cooperate if something is done to help them. Glavinic says Victoria Cloutier wants to continue to be on the sub-committee, despite her resignation from VCCPG.

Motion: Move to accept Tribal Liaison Mission Statement as revised with mutual

Maker/Second: Glavinic/ NorwoodJohnson

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0. Voice vote

5.d.

Discussion of, and possible vote on, frequency of VCCPG meetings—monthly or less (Smith)

Discussion: Smith says there is no requirement for frequency of meeting. He added that meeting less frequently might cause loss of timely input on issues that concern Valley Center. Quinley wants to meet once per month or more frequently. Lewis suggests regular meetings comport with public awareness. Rudolf concurs with Lewis.

5.e.

AT&T Mobility, SD0634 Superior Hollow MUP; 3300-11-008 (P11-008); 12746 Superior Hollow Road, an unmanned cell site. Project Contact Karen Adler at 760-715-3416; (DPLU Planner is Michelle Chan 858-694-2610) (Mark Jackson)

Discussion: Jackson presented the request for an unmanned cell tower site. Dawn Marshall, a resident praised Mark for his attention to this issue. She has questions for the ATT rep to address before agreeing to this project. She requests continuance to allow contact with neighbors and AT&T. Not opposed, but wants questions answered. Ted Marincelli [sp] suggests he could attempt to answer questions if the item could be trailed until later for a vote. Vote is trailed. All agree water tower design fits neighborhood better than faux palm tree. It is compliant with zoning and the community plan. The tower will emit very low radiation compared to standard permitted. Bachman asks for conditions. AT&T will repair the paved road if damaged during construction. Hofler notes poor, pot-holed condition of Anthony Rd. Construction may damage Anthony

Motion: Move to approve request under conditions that AT&T use water tower design for cell tower and that any damage to the private access road caused during construction is repaired to original condition

Maker/Second: Jackson/Quinley

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-1 Voice vote

Notes:Hofler abstains

5.f.

Administrative Permit Wind Turbine, Site Plan; 3000-11-006 (AD11-06) located at 26904 Del Ridge Lane; Owner is Chris Stephens 858-527-5505 (DPLU Planner David Sibbet at 858-694-3091) (Brian Bachman)

Discussion: Bachman asks if neighbors are present [none apparent]. Bachman thought installation of similar initial systems was complete. This new system request was for Paradise Mountain area. Setback requirement is met for 5 turbines. View-shed is from Paradise Mountain Road. Bachman had no discussion with neighbors, but they were sent notice of this meeting. Smith noted Valley Center Fire District visited manufacturer because of interest in turbines continuing to operate during fire and smoke. VCFD will work with manufacturer to address turn off issue. Manufacturer will mount a system on VCFD training roof to evaluate stopping and securing systems. Manufacturer is looking to develop lockdown mechanism. Glavinic asks about how many systems will we review before allowing administrative permitting. Smith says we will continue looking at these systems until we are satisfied. VCCPG will be looking to get input from neighbors re systems. Smith expressed concerned about no neighbor face-to-face contact regarding installation of such systems. Bachman points out that County is working toward allowing such systems by right. He indicates that we will be getting more and more requests. Rudolf agrees with approval. Suggests more information is better for evaluation. This is like an experiment. Present owner didn't fill out noise compliance agreement.

Motion: Move to approve AD11-06 contingent on property owner filing a noise compliance agreement

Maker/Second: Bachman/Quinley

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0, Voice vote

5.g.

Discussion and possible vote on GP Update items from the subcommittee (Rudolf)

Discussion: There was nothing to report

5.h.	Discussion and possible vote on Mobility Subcommittee issues including road sight distances at Valley Center Road and Miller Rd and Mirar de Valle and Valley Center Road, the stop sign at Paradise Mountain, Emergency Evacuation issues and the Road Standards review. (Davis)	
Discussion: Davis presents Sager/McNally road upgrade. Davis notes that this item is not explicitly on the agenda and could be challenged later. Glavinic objects and asks to consider this item at next meeting. Rudolf has no objection to considering presently based on compromises made between County, Mobility SC, and Trails Association and thinks McNally Road should be removed from bicycle and trails maps. Applicant representative Jim Whalen agrees with Rudolf that topography limits trail in one portion. Glavinic notes that trails are not for bicycles and road would not accommodate bicycles and vehicles. Lanes shown are limited to 14-foot lane and no bicycle lane. Glavinic agrees that it should be eliminated from bicycle map. Davis notes that the item was discussed by the Mobility SC. The project map is already approved. The question is about conformance of the trail which is proposed to move from north to south side of road. Glavinic wants to condition approval on including softer or rolled curbs. Davis indicates that, according to Goralka, rolled curbs were not possible without larger lane width and that the plan is already approved. Glavinic cites example of Orchard Run. Rudolf says if DPW is willing and applicant is willing, we would want rolled curbs, but safety warrants ninety-degree curb to contain cars. Glavinic counters with need for recovery room.		
Motion: Move to consider McNally issue presently		
Maker/Second: Rudolf/Quinley		Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-1-0. Voice vote
Notes: Glavinic dissents		
Motion: Move for approval of exception to road standards for McNally road improvement [TPM21004] [Davis/Vick]		
Maker/Second: Rudolf/Quinley		Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-1-0. Voice vote
Notes: Glavinic dissents		
Discussion Continues: Sight line distances at the intersection of Shilo Lane /Paradise Mountain Rd. have been cited as an issue. County analysis says it is desirable and warranted to add a stop sign for Shilo Lane. The Mobility SC agrees.		
Motion: Move to approve Mobility SC recommendation to install stop sign for Shilo Lane at Paradise Mountain Road		
Maker/Second: Davis/Glavinic		Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0. Voice Vote
Discussion Continues: Davis reported that the issues concerning the Mirar de Valle/Valley Center Road intersection combined with the left turns to and from Valley Center Foods Market and the intersection of Miller/Valley Center Road were continued for further consideration. Glavinic notes developers may have responsibilities for installation of signal at Mirar De Valle.		
Davis says that two other issues, vehicle speed feedback signs along Valley Center Road and Street Lights for intersections along Valley Center Road east of the Cole Grade intersection are recommended by the SC. Rudolf asks why DPW doesn't fix problems in accident-prone areas with their budget. Four speed feedback signs are proposed. One on north-bound Valley Center Road south of Woods Valley Road, one on north-bound Valley Center Road near Mirar de Valle and two on south-bound Valley Center Road south of Old Road and near Cobb Lane. Glavinic asserts that the signs are ineffective for locals who will eventually ignore them. Vick objects to that characterization. He says out-of-town visitors will respond to signs. Hofler says one or two is good, four is too many, but agrees that the signs are appropriate. Glavinic supports low sodium lights at intersections. Hofler objects to the need for lighted intersections. Glavinic suggests they are generally for benefit of pedestrians. Rudolf objects to considering only selected items from list. Wants to continue the discussion so consideration can be made of the entire priority list. Davis offers that in consideration of speed surveys to be done in December 2011, speed signs would need to be in place to have desired effect of maintaining a lowered speed limit. The speed signs may take six months to install.		
Motion: Move to approve expenditure of approximately \$60,000 for four speed feedback signs		
Maker/Second: Davis/Glavinic		Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-1-0. Voice vote
Notes: Hofler dissents		
5.i.	Discussion and vote on forming an Equestrian subcommittee to provide the VCCPG with recommendations on Valley Center's initial response to the Board of Supervisors especially District 2 and District 5 Supervisors request for options. (Smith)	

<p>Discussion: Smith attended meeting to consider horse use ordinance options and the issues pertaining to those options. The options discussed were By-right Stables throughout the County, a Tiered Ordinance Option [allowing horse use with varied permit requirements], a Conservative Ordinance Option [minor changes to existing ordinance], and a Status Quo Option. A key element of the discussions was that stakeholder representatives discuss the issues with their planning groups and give feedback. Smith believes VCCPG should form a new equine sub-committee. Rudolf questions the need for a new committee, suggests that present stakeholders could suffice. Smith wants horse-owners and neighbors of horse-owners on the committee. Jeff Cowell, resident involved with horses, says VC doesn't have sufficient representation for horse owners or horse facilities. He contends that VCCPG must work with county directly. He strongly encourages formation of equine sub-committee. Lewis supports community involvement. Hofler will volunteer. Glavinic supports formation of a new committee.</p>	
<p>Motion: Move to form an Equine Ordinance Sub-committee with Smith as Chair</p>	
<p>Maker/Second: Smith/Glavinic Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0. Voice vote</p>	
<p>Motion: Move that membership of the Equine Ordinance Sub-committee consist of Hofler, Davis, Cheryl Lacy, Bob Thomas, Jeff Cowell, and Fran DeWilde, with Smith as Chair</p>	
<p>Maker/Second: Smith/Glavinic Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0. Voice vote</p>	
5.j.	<p>Discussion and vote on ratifying a letter from VCCPG to the Board of Supervisors concerning (and objecting to) recommendations to downgrade specific projects to "minor" impact status and reiterating strong objections to the proposed study area requested by the Accretive Group. (Rudolf, Smith)</p>
<p>Discussion: Smith sent letter to BOS based on information previously presented to VCCPG. Smith requests ratification of his action by VCCPG. Glavinic objects to Smith having already sent the letter. He regards it as inappropriate without prior approval of VCCPG. Smith notes that VCCPG has already considered and voted on items in letter. Smith summarized those issues in the letter and felt the urgency to send the letter for consideration by BOS before approval of letter specifics could be accomplished by VCCPG. He wanted those positions represented to BOS at this important juncture. Hofler supports sending letter; suggests this procedure is common in planning group practice. John Rilling [Accretive] wants to clarify last-minute Special Study Area [SAA] request for Accretive project. He says a rumored email suggests SAA will obviate the need for a General Plan Amendment. Not true, he contends. An SAA will not circumvent planning process. SAA does not convey entitlement. It is merely an overlay to designate further study. He believes that the 'minor' change designation by the County is appropriate. His company will show many features of the proposed Accretive project before final plan is presented.</p>	
<p>Motion: Move to ratify chair sending a letter to BOS outlining concerns on specific projects and supporting GPU planning and community planning documents. [***Letter attached below]</p>	
<p>Maker/Second: Smith/Rudolf Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 12-2-0, except item three of the letter 10-2-2</p>	
<p>Notes: Jackson and Britsch recuse on letter item three [reference to Accretive]; Glavinic and Norwood-Johnson dissent on all letter items.</p>	
6.	Subcommittee Reports & Business: no reports
a)	Mobility – Robert Davis, Chair.
b)	GP Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair.
c)	Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair.
d)	Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair.
e)	Parks & Rec. – Brian Bachman, Chair.
f)	Rancho Lilac – Ann Quinley, Chair. - inactive
g)	Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair.
h)	Spanish Valley Ranch – Oliver Smith, Chair. - inactive
i)	Tribal Liason – Larry Glavinic Co-Chair; Victoria Cloutier, Co-Chair
j)	Website – Robert Davis, Chair.
k)	Pauma Ranch – Christine Lewis, Co-Chair; LaVonne Norwood-Johnson, Co-Chair.
7.	Correspondence Received:
a)	DPLU to VCCPG Matz Commercial Building Site Plan B Designator, 1500-10-013 (STP 10-013) , 8719 Old Castle Road, Escondido 92026 and Champaign Blvd, Project includes construction of a 8000SF single story commercial

	building to include office space, deli, Restaurant and Dental Office.; contact: James Fleming 619-743-5770 (DPLU Planner is David Sibbet 858-694-3091) (Jon Vick for VCCPG)	
b)	DPLU to VCCPG, Property Specific Request to be designed a Special Study Area (SSA) in the Community Plan made by Randy Good on behalf of Various Property Owners for 411.7 acres and 34 parcels. Located approximately .05 miles east of I-15 and North of Nelson Way. (DPLU Planner: Devon Muto, Chief Department of Planning and Land Use) (Steve Hutchison for VCCPG)	
c)	DPLU to VCCPG, Superior Hollow Wireless Telecommunications Facility Major Use Permit for AT&T Wireless; Case Numbers 3300-11-008 (MPU); project address 12746 Superior Hollow Road. Guide for further processing of application. (Mark Slovick is DPLU planner at 858-495-5172) (Mark Jackson for VCCPG)	
d)	Attorneys for Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District to Oliver Smith and VCCPG, Statement of Good Cause why its notice of Appeal to the Interior Board of Indian Appeals is timely concerning the decision to take in trust property located in Valley Center for the San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of California.	
e)	Attorneys for the San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians to Amy Dutschke, Director, Pacific Region, United States Bureau of Indian Affairs with copy to VCCPG, response to Statement of Good Cause filed by the Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District concerning their timely appeal of decision to take in trust property located in Valley Center for the San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians.	
f)	Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District to Accretive Group of Companies with copy to VCCPG, concerning Mr. Goodson's commitment to reach a comprehensive mitigation agreement with the school district regarding their proposed development.	
g)	San Diego County Traffic Advisory Committee to VCCPG, Radar Recertification of Existing 40 MPH Speed Limit on Woods Valley Road from 900 feet east of Mile Post 1 easterly to the west line of North Lake Wohlford Road (2.7 miles). Committee recommends recertification for continued radar speed enforcement of the existing 40 MPH speed limit.	
8.	Motion to Adjourn: 9.40pm	
	Maker/Second: Rudolf/Quinley	Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0. Voice vote

Attachment

***Letter from Oliver Smith, Chair VCCPG, to Board of Supervisors – Ref. item 5.j. above.

April 10, 2011

Chairman Horn and Honorable Supervisors:

Thank you for making progress toward adopting the new General Plan for San Diego County. Your re-confirmation of the Principles that have guided the development of the GPU for the last twelve years, and your vote not to launch new CEQA studies and reopen the DEIR, are comforting.

As we are all aware, the Staff/Planning Commission Recommendation already incorporates a large number of “special requests.” The Valley Center Community Planning Group urges you to stay the course -- particularly pertaining to properties that are being processed currently as private General Plan Amendments, and to requests by owners of remote properties for “spot zoning” at increased intensities that will cause the additional upzoning of adjacent properties.

A number of these “MINOR” referrals are, indeed, quite major. They should NOT be swept into the GPU. The following items in Valley Center are particularly alarming. Please pull them for study, discussion and separate vote:

“MINORS” THAT ARE “MAJOR” AND NOT SUPPORTED BY VCCPG

1. VC 12 Castle Creek Condos: SR2 to VR20

- SPA/GPA in process. VCCPG & VCDRB opposes intensity.

- 2000% Spot Upzone: from 1du:2 acres to 20 dus:1 acre, includes Regional Category change from Semi-Rural to Village.
- Referral property is 4-acre parking lot in a COMPLETED Specific Plan. Existing golf course homes are clustered around open space.
- SPA/GPA proposes high-density 3-story “senior” condos in a high fire risk area; automobile dependent; only services 8-10 miles south.
- VR20 in an SR2 area is spot zoning in a Semi-Rural location. Village residential density outside a designated Village and without Village services and amenities contradicts numerous Planning Principles!
- To upzone by 2000% this finished clustered project reflects exactly what Planning Groups fear most about the “Conservation Subdivision.”
- To approve this SPA/GPA upzone as part of the GPU would severely undermine public trust in the process.

2. VC 21 Andes/Chairo: RL20 to SR10

- Spot Upzone.
- Regional Category change RL20 to SR10).
- Will require upzone of adjacent RL20 property.
- Remote, high fire-risk area at the end of a dead-end road (Paradise Mountain).
- Classified MINOR only because the request was on the Referral Map and has been rejected repeatedly during this process for all of these reasons.
- Requires Project Objectives changes, and is NOT “Minor.”

3. VC68 Accretive: Private GPA/SPA to Public “Special Study Area”

- Request submitted after close of public testimony.
- An “end run” around the public process in yet another attempt to insert their private development into the public planning process.
- Board voted in 2008 to remove this project from the GPU, and to process separately as a PAA/GPA.
- PAA/GPA proposes Regional Category change, 800% upzone of Semi-Rural farmland to a city the size of Del Mar and adding 1746 more homes to a General Plan that already more than adequately accommodates growth.
- PAA/GPA violates Guiding Principles, is not a pipelined project, and is leapfrog development. Designation as a “Special Study Area” prematurely commits the County to amending the General Plan designation outside of the established process for General Plan Amendments.
- Private development should not be accommodated by a land use designation that has been created to facilitate the PUBLIC planning process.

Please pull these Special Property Requests from the Minor List and vote to reject them, like the other Moderate and Major referrals.

“MINORS” SUPPORTED BY THE VCCPG

The Valley Center Community Planning Group supports the following Special Property Requests that the staff has classified as MINOR – presuming they will not require recirculation

of the DEIR.

ALL of the requests below:

- Reduce the previously requested densities.
- Are consistent with the Project Objectives and Guiding Principles.
- Less intensive than the existing DEIR.
- Help “right-size” our Villages as recommended by the VCCPG, the DPLU Staff and your Planning Commission.

1. VC 2,3, and 4: Reduce intensity in remote, habitat-rich, high fire-risk areas

2. VC 28 Chipman: Expired PAA.

- Deny Village intensity outside the North Village. Inconsistent with Village plan

3. VC 55 Gaughan: C36 Zoning in North Village Commercial

- Consistent with Village plan

4. VC 56 Rancho Lilac: Retain longstanding SPA designation

- Consistent with GP density

5. VC 58 South Village adjacent to Commercial/Mixed Use: SR2 to VR4.3

- Consistent with Village plan

6. VC 62 Bell and Coseo parcels in South Village: Mixed Use to Commercial

- Consistent with Village plan

Finally, please remove Road 3A from the Circulation Map, and deal with it only in the totality of a proposed final project for the Accretive PAA/GPA/SP, anticipated to come before you in two years or so.

Thank you and the DPLU staff for working with the Valley Center community to help make our long-planned central Villages a better plan with this update. We truly appreciate your efforts for the betterment of our community as well as for San Diego County as a whole.

Respectfully,

Oliver J. Smith

Chair,
Valley Center Community Planning Group